UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Agricultural Adjustment Administration
Alfred D. Stedman, Assistant Administrator
Director, Division of Information,
Washington, D. C.

No. 74 April 13, 1935

To Editors of Farm Journals:

The following information is for your use.

DeWitt C. Wing
Specialist in Information

WHEAT GROWERS TO VOTE IN NATION-WIDE REFERENDUM

In a nation-wide referendum on May 25, 1935, wheat growers in the United States will vote on whether they favor continuing wheat production adjustment measures under the Agricultural Adjustment Act after 1935.

The initial adjustment contracts between wheat growers and the Secretary of Agriculture, signed in 1933, expire with the close of the crop year 1935.

Preliminary proposals for a new program to be considered by farmers in the referendum vote follow the fundamental features and principles of the first program, with additional emphasis upon inducements to shift land in the drought and dust-storm area from wheat production to grass.

Like the 1933-1935 program, the plan now under discussion would be based on voluntary contracts signed by farmers, in which they would agree to adjust their wheat acreage to meet consumption needs in this country and possible export outlets, during the crop years 1936, 1937, 1938 and 1939.

Signers would receive, in return, rental and benefit payments calculated upon their average annual wheat production during the years 1928 to 1932, inclusive. Acreage bases of individual producers upon which planting adjustments would be determined would be the annual average for the years 1930 to 1932, inclusive. Both the production and the acreage base periods are the same as those used in the earlier program. Other features under consideration for inclusion in the proposed 1936-1939 contract are:

1. Provision for devoting contracted or shifted acres to uses consistent with sound farming practice, with special inducement for shifting land in the

drought area from wheat to permanent grass land. Other authorized uses of contracted acres to include: The growing of such long-time, non-competitive crops as hay, pasture and timber; the growing of crops that prevent soil erosion; weed-control measures, and summer fallowing of land, in addition to acreage ordinarily summer-fallowed.

2. Provision for minor adjustments on individual farms to take care of crop rotation and other proved farm practices.

3. Determination by the Secretary of Agriculture of the amount of adjustment to be made each year, such adjustment not to result in an authorized acreage more than 25 percent below the individual's base acreage.

4. Rate and condition of benefit payments to be determined and announced before the beginning of each marketing year, as has been done under the initial program.

5. Local administration of the new program, as of the earlier program, through county production-control associations made up of contract signers, and through county allotment committees selected by the members of the county associations.

Approximately 575,000 contracts were signed in the 1933-1935 program. These contracts covered 51,400,000 acres, or 78 percent of the annual average of 65,926,000 acres seeded to wheat in the United States during the base period 1930-1932.

Under the first wheat production adjustment program, signers were authorized to plant for 1934 harvest 85 percent of their base acreage, or 43,690,000 acres.

The original authorization for 1935 harvest was 90 percent of the base acreage, or 46,260,000 acres. On March 20, 1935, because of the development of the possibility of a recurrence of drought in wheat-growing regions, restrictions on wheat planting on farms covered by wheat allotment contracts were modified in order to obviate any shortage of wheat caused by low yields.

Plans for the technique of holding the wheat growers' referendum on the continuation of the wheat program will be discussed during the week beginning April 15, at meetings of wheat growers' representatives, and the Washington and field personnel of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and the Agricultural Extension Service called for Indianapolis, Ind., Kansas City, Mo., Walla Walla, Wash., Fargo, N. D., and Washington, D. C.

These meetings will be followed by others, within the wheat-producing States, of officials of county production control associations and personnel of the Extension Service and Adjustment Administration, and by community meetings of farmers to discuss the present economic situation of wheat, the future outlook, and the progress made under the initial wheat-adjustment program.

# # #

WHEAT ADJUSTMENT PAYMENTS ON WAIVED ACREAGES

Secretary of Agriculture Wallace has approved the making of 1935 adjustment payments to those wheat producers for whom this year's minimum planting requirement has been waived because of extreme drought conditions, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has announced. The payment will make available again this year, as last year, a partial crop-income insurance for those producers in such drought areas.

The waivers on minimum planting requirements are made only in counties officially designated by the Wheat Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and then only by the county wheat production control committees upon individual applications of producers. The planting requirement is waived only where there is evidence that the soil has been prepared for planting and where it is evident at the time of planting that planting seed would be a waste.

The rate of the 1935 payment will be determined later in the year after the processing tax for the coming crop year has been announced.

# # #

1934 CORN LOANS DUE JULY 1, 1935

The second of government loans on farm-stored corn, which were first inaugurated in the fall of 1933 as a financial aid to enable producers to market their crop in more orderly fashion and to obtain advantage of price increases, will be completed on July 1, 1935, when commodity loans on 1934 corn will become due and payable.

No extension of this maturity date will be made, according to the Commodity Credit Corporation, through which the loans were made, and, in view of the prevailing current prices for corn, all producer-borrowers are expected to repay fully the amount of their loans, at the loan value rate of 55 cents a bushel, plus interest at 4 percent and insurance charges, prior to or at maturity on July 1, 1935.

While 1934 loans are due and payable, officials of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration pointed out that provision for government loans on corn stored on farms in surplus-producing areas definitely will be a part of the corn-hog adjustment program for 1935.

Commodity Credit Corporation officials point out that the loan agreement under which the 1934 loans were made provides that "any holder may declare the note immediately due and payable - - - when and so long as the price of number two (2) corn, on the basis of cash transactions or contracts for future delivery on the near quoted month, as determined by the United States Department of Agriculture, on Chicago Board of Trade, shall be at or above 85 cents per bushel."

The price of No. 2 corn at Chicago during the past several weeks has averaged between 85 and 90 cents a bushel.

Although farmers' notes must be paid in full by the maturity date, they have the option, up until that time, of making partial payments and obtaining the release of an amount of sealed corn equivalent to the partial payment made. All such partial releases must be expressly authorized by the Commodity Credit Corporation and must be made under the supervision of an official State sealer, who will then reseal the crib.

Borrowers' notes now outstanding in connection with the Government's corn loan program amount to approximately $8,830,000, representing approximately 16,054,000 bushels of corn under seal on corn-belt farms. The Commodity Credit Corporation holds paper for about one-third of these outstanding notes, the balance being held by local banks and similar financial institutions under the agreement of the Corporation to purchase such paper. Borrowers have already repaid about $2,025,000, releasing 3,685,000 bushels of corn.

The total amount of money loaned under the 1934 loan program was approximately $10,856,000, collateralized by about 19,739,000 bushels of corn. These loans, by States, in round figures, were: Colorado, $4,460; Illinois, $2,637,549; Indiana, $267,851; Iowa, $5,845,239; Kansas, $11,139; Minnesota, $405,036; Missouri, $125,346; Nebraska, $1,311,699; Ohio, $51,246; South Dakota, $195,640.

The volume of loans during the past season was not as great as under the original program, because corn prices in the meantime had risen considerably above the loan value. Loans made on farm-stored corn in the winter of 1933-34 amounted to approximately $120,500,000 and the volume of corn put into storage amounted to about 270,000,000 bushels. The loan rate was 45 cents a bushel.

Corn loans have been made only to borrowers who agreed to participate in the corn-hog adjustment program. The loan program is recognized as a valuable device for carrying reserve supplies from one year to another, provided that it is coupled with sound production control.

As in the two preceding programs, only producers and landlords who sign the corn-hog adjustment contract this spring will be eligible for the 1935 loan. The amount to be loaned per bushel will not be announced until later, when probable corn production and feed requirements have been determined.

# # #

RENTAL AND BENEFIT PAYMENTS TOTAL $630,606,962

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration has issued an analysis of disbursements totaling $630,606,962 in rental and benefit payments to farmers participating in adjustment programs, and expenditures of $214,651,202 in connection with the removal, utilization and conservation of surplus agricultural commodities. The total expenditures of the Adjustment Administration

since organization, May 12, 1933, including the above amount of rental and benefit payments, surplus removal and utilization expenditures, and $42,254,090 in cost of administration, up to March 1, 1935, amounted to $887,512,255.

The analysis shows rental and benefit payments to date of March 1, 1935, by state, commodity and program; by state, commodity and calendar year; and in the regular monthly Comptroller's report, as of the same date, all expenditures cumulative since the inception of the programs are shown by commodity, state and county.

The Comptroller's report lists the total of $630,606,952 in rental and benefit payments, cumulative for all programs, by comodities, as follows: Cotton, $221,182,638; wheat, $158,625,961; tobacco, $24,053,184; corn-hogs, $223,453,054, and sugar, $3,292,124.

The Comptroller's report divides the $214,651,202 expended in the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities, export operations, conservation operations and miscellaneous disbursements, as follows:

Hog purchases and pork for relief distribution, $46,080,106; export of regional surplus of wheat from the Pacific Northwest, $6,097,239; purchases of butter and cheese for relief distribution, $16,529,760; drought cattle purchases and conservation of products thereof for relief distribution, $112,746,219; purchases of sheep and goats and conservation of products for relief distribution, $7,660,968; conservation of supplies of adapted seeds, $16,638,993; sugar purchases, $365,536; peanut diversion payments, $347,823; disbursements under rice trust fund, $42,269; disbursement to sellers of cotton-tax-exemption certificates, $8,142,284.

It should be noted that funds disbursed for cotton tax-exemption certificates were derived from the sales of surplus cotton tax-exemption certificates to producers by the Pool organized to handle this operation, and that this item represents reimbursement of producers who placed excess certificates in the pool for sale.

Funds for the purchase of drought cattle were made available partly under the Jones-Connally amendment to the Adjustment Act, and partly from the appropriations allocated for this purpose under the Emergency Appropriations Act. Funds were also provided under the Emergency Appropriations Act for purchase of drought sheep and goats, and for the conservation of seeds.

As of the same date as the report, the returns from processing and related taxes reached a cumulative total of $731,982,189. By commodity on which collected the receipts were as follows:

Wheat, $202,425,151; cotton, $210,447,192; tobacco, $39,784,489; field corn, $9,200,597; hogs, $210,335,443; paper and jute (compensatory tax on products competitive to cotton), $11,683,061; sugar cane and sugar beets, $43,281,831; peanuts, $1,308,892; cotton ginning tax under Bankhead Act, $555,738; tobacco producers' sales tax, under Kerr-Smith Act, $2,959,741.

Following are various tables showing collections of processing tax, break-down rental and benefit payments by state and adjustment program, by state and calendar year, and the regular Comptroller's monthly report:

Table 1

Processing and related taxes collected for the month of February and accumulative to February 28, 1935, as reported by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Commodity and Type	Total to January 31, 1935	Collections February 1935	Total to February 28, 1935
WHEAT	$192,579,338.83	$ 9,845,812.59	$202,425,151.42
COTTON	202,894,046.96	7,553,145.91	210,447,192.87
TOBACCO	36,874,386.82	2,910,103.15	39,784,489.97
FIELD CORN	8,710,188.97	490,408.47	9,200,597.44
HOGS	198,572,788.04	11,762,655.13	210,335,443.17
PAPER & JUTE	11,533,486.78	149,574.43	11,683,061.21
SUGAR CANE & SUGAR BEETS	38,499,789.69	4,782,041.80	43,281,831.49
PEANUTS	890,528.49	418,413.78	1,308,942.27
COTTON GINNING TAX	230,902.53	324,836.01	555,738.54
TOBACCO PRODUCERS' SALES TAX	2,093,080.60	866,660.78	2,959,741.38
	$692,878,537.71	$39,103,652.05	$731,982,189.76

Table 2

Rental and Benefit Payments through Feb. 28, 1935,
Analyzed by State, Commodity and Program

STATE	COTTON		
	Total	1933 Program	1934 Program
Alabama	$ 19,508,817.13	$ 9,616,676.11	$ 9,892,141.02
Arizona	1,114,900.44	267,514.56	847,385.88
Arkansas	21,332,682.10	10,838,347.44	10,494,334.66
California	1,288,749.51	163,804.67	1,124,944.84
Colorado			
Connecticut			
Delaware			
Florida	524,149.28	261,738.42	262,410.86
Georgia	17,410,510.37	7,986,389.95	9,424,129.42
Idaho			
Illinois			
Indiana			
Iowa			
Kansas	4,401.61	3,088.00	1,313.61
Kentucky	98,343.97	41,865.00	56,478.97
Louisiana	10,918,382.40	5,007,618.02	5,910,764.38
Maine			
Maryland			
Massachusetts			
Michigan			
Minnesota			
Mississippi	22,215,393.65	10,103,926.52	12,111,467.13
Missouri	3,538,645.58	1,843,484.70	1,695,160.88
Montana			
Nebraska			
Nevada			
New Hampshire			
New Jersey			
New Mexico	998,639.32	364,060.00	634,579.32
New York			
North Carolina	8,044,776.14	2,827,271.83	5,217,504.31
North Dakota			
Ohio			
Oklahoma	19,447,293.46	11,706,658.68	7,740,634.78
Oregon			
Pennsylvania			
Puerto Rico			
Rhode Island			
South Carolina	11,328,622.35	4,717,347.48	6,611,274.87
South Dakota			
Tennessee	6,834,477.92	3,329,366.27	2,505,111.65
Texas	76,170,218.61	43,342,882.31	32,827,331.30
Utah			
Vermont			
Virginia	403,625.52	130,223.10	273,402.42
Washington			
West Virginia			
Wisconsin			
Wyoming			
	$221,182,638.36	$112,552,263.06	$108,630,375.30

Table 2 (continued)
Rental and Benefit Payments through February 28, 1935
Analyzed by State, Commodity and Program

STATES	WHEAT			
	Total	1933 Program	1934 Program	County Prod. Control Assns.
Alabama	$	$	$	$
Arizona	30,524.24	18,632.89	11,130.80	760.55
Arkansas	3,019.19	2,177.39	780.80	61.00
California	1,856,477.13	1,101,639.77	724,530.47	30,306.89
Colorado	3,378,337.65	1,937,070.07	1,304,379.58	136,888.00
Connecticut				
Delaware	173,922.21	101,870.84	67,631.20	4,420.17
Florida				
Georgia	11,160.19	6,951.60	4,048.80	159.79
Idaho	5,565,012.74	3,168,677.25	2,200,532.66	195,802.83
Illinois	4,025,692.79	2,242,096.02	1,578,006.85	205,589.92
Indiana	3,131,359.52	1,691,908.95	1,283,280.55	156,070.02
Iowa	709,390.39	388,916.71	297,115.10	23,358.58
Kansas	39,482,762.66	22,876,386.04	15,640,053.73	966,322.89
Kentucky	386,018.13	214,888.78	144,445.10	26,684.25
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland	1,326,497.61	741,669.04	554,774.12	30,054.45
Massachusetts				
Michigan	1,364,004.05	755,152.27	553,663.12	55,188.66
Minnesota	3,068,269.08	1,702,106.68	1,234,441.50	131,720.90
Mississippi				
Missouri	2,527,841.04	1,384,165.46	1,038,786.11	104,889.47
Montana	9,949,929.07	5,672,842.10	3,822,498.33	454,588.64
Nebraska	9,637,012.19	5,498,480.15	3,875,820.24	262,711.80
Nevada	47,268.42	26,707.79	18,513.20	2,047.43
New Hampshire				
New Jersey	18,872.57	9,527.06	7,477.40	1,868.11
New Mexico	806,658.66	472,797.88	321,440.75	12,420.03
New York	62,992.32	37,329.49	21,665.80	3,997.03
North Carolina	80,438.07	46,935.87	30,023.20	3,479.00
North Dakota	24,075,816.18	13,791,582.73	9,672,362.62	611,870.83
Ohio	2,771,876.13	1,540,939.85	1,084,947.59	145,988.69
Oklahoma	11,188,338.27	6,483,330.40	4,446,976.80	258,031.07
Oregon	4,101,855.10	2,432,540.63	1,558,852.03	110,462.44
Pennsylvania	407,780.32	216,279.14	157,902.20	33,598.98
Puerto Rico				
Rhode Island				
South Carolina				
South Dakota	8,285,829.10	4,757,109.49	3,310,252.03	218,467.58
Tennessee	195,073.78	113,273.23	75,077.59	6,722.96
Texas	8,646,356.97	5,063,108.81	3,380,570.71	202,677.45
Utah	1,054,044.55	594,488.55	413,012.18	46,543.82
Vermont				
Virginia	868,738.32	477,339.86	339,920.23	51,478.23
Washington	8,536,334.05	5,250,129.85	3,041,480.87	244,723.33
West Virginia	123,999.67	71,113.33	47,642.80	5,243.54
Wisconsin	62,294.81	33,756.72	24,203.60	4,334.49
Wyoming	664,264.22	371,288.45	266,799.39	26,176.38
	$158,625,961.39	$91,295,211.14	$62,555,040.05	$4,775,710.20

Table 2 (continued)
Rental and Benefit Payments through February 28, 1935,
Analyzed by State, Commodity and Program

STATES	TOBACCO			
	Total	1933 Program	1934 Program	County Prod. Control Assns.
Alabama	$ 3,053.20	$	$ 3,053.20	$
Arizona				
Arkansas	180.00		180.00	
California	894,277.22	301,976.02	592,301.20	
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
Florida	245,564.16	63,553.65	182,010.51	
Georgia	1,485,488.15	22,035.60	1,463,452.55	
Idaho				
Illinois	888.85	267.95	620.90	
Indiana	156,129.35	1,696.32	144,535.30	9,897.73
Iowa				
Kansas	8,269.14		7,786.18	482.96
Kentucky	6,002,567.49		5,776,879.61	225,687.88
Louisiana				
Maine				
Maryland	38,463.37		35,248.00	3,215.37
Massachusetts	377,162.98	120,724.28	256,438.70	
Michigan				
Minnesota	67,062.14	27,972.14	39,090.00	
Mississippi				
Missouri	140,070.37		135,270.48	4,799.89
Montana				
Nebraska				
Nevada				
New Hampshire	8,297.80	2,594.30	5,703.50	
New Jersey				
New Mexico				
New York	60,127.61	26,820.01	33,307.60	
North Carolina	5,738,355.70		5,730,159.70	8,196.00
North Dakota				
Ohio	965,946.52	409,638.56	543,026.78	13,281.18
Oklahoma				
Oregon				
Pennsylvania	1,106,406.89	548,800.09	557,606.80	
Puerto Rico	1,199,046.00		1,199,046.00	
Rhode Island				
South Carolina	1,864,035.95		1,864,035.95	
South Dakota				
Tennessee	1,571,582.50		1,499,024.38	72,558.21
Texas				
Utah				
Vermont	9,342.53	2,833.33	6,509.20	
Virginia	896,961.33		867,030.93	29,930.40
Washington				
West Virginia	82,948.46		79,024.48	3,923.98
Wisconsin	1,130,956.41	527,160.53	603,795.88	
Wyoming				
	$24,053,184.21	2,056,072.78	$21,625,137.83	$371,973.60

Table 2 (continued)
Rental and Benefit Payments through February 28, 1935
Analyzed by State, Commodity and Program

STATE	Corn-Hogs	Sugar	All Programs Grand Total
Alabama	$ 314,332.00	$	$ 19,826,202.33
Arizona	39,847.56		1,185,272.24
Arkansas	831,945.28		22,167,826.57
California	1,298,391.47	167,034.29	4,610,652.40
Colorado	1,995,373.10	304,184.40	5,677,895.15
Connecticut	27,418.68		921,695.90
Delaware	29,503.57		203,425.78
Florida	213,596.76		983,310.20
Georgia	103,307.10		19,010,474.81
Idaho	841,032.83	456,336.65	6,862,382.22
Illinois	28,966,527.07		32,993,108.71
Indiana	17,573,992.13		20,861,381.00
Iowa	52,911,829.12		53,621,219.51
Kansas	12,388,114.35	79,312.20	51,962,859.96
Kentucky	3,075,975.40		9,562,904.99
Louisiana	53,199.65	1,413,638.10	12,385,220.15
Maine	2,006.00		2,006.00
Maryland	414,543.70		1,779,504.68
Massachusetts	267,084.67		644,247.65
Michigan	2,357,284.00		3,721,288.05
Minnesota	15,058,892.36		18,194,223.58
Mississippi	31,969.35		22,247,363.00
Missouri	18,106,050.67		24,312,607.66
Montana	420,592.02		10,370,521.09
Nebraska	21,987,204.05	172,375.55	31,796,591.79
Nevada	38,892.59		86,161.01
New Hampshire	22,302.03		30,599.83
New Jersey	227,521.21		246,393.78
New Mexico	315,614.60		2,120,912.58
New York	173,717.05		296,836.98
North Carolina	482,556.37		14,346,126.28
North Dakota	2,310,884.85		26,386,701.03
Ohio	12,129,585.88		15,867,408.53
Oklahoma	3,581,104.60		34,216,736.33
Oregon	528,670.20		4,630,525.30
Pennsylvania	336,324.95		1,850,512.16
Puerto Rico			1,199,046.00
Rhode Island	2,864.39		2,864.39
South Carolina	225,928.20		13,418,586.50
South Dakota	10,378,412.93	14,479.80	18,678,721.83
Tennessee	2,357,560.59		10,958,694.88
Texas	3,274,217.83		88,090,793.41
Utah	138,747.16	495,758.00	1,688,549.71
Vermont	42,752.87		52,095.40
Virginia	1,099,488.68		3,268,813.85
Washington	495,840.24	644.10	9,032,818.39
West Virginia	205,536.79		412,484.92
Wisconsin	5,406,921.46		6,600,172.68
Wyoming	367,595.99	188,361.32	1,220,221.53
	$223,453,054.35	$3,292,124.41	$630,606,962.72

Table 3

Rental and Benefit Payments for the Calendar Year 1933
Analyzed by State and Commodity

State	Total	Cotton	Wheat	Tobacco
Alabama	$ 9,537,007.25	$ 9,537,007.25	$	$
Arizona	268,194.16	258,381.96	9,812.20	
Arkansas	10,667,598.82	10,667,598.82		
California	243,353.47	160,781.67	82,571.80	
Colorado	267,418.40		267,418.40	
Connecticut	169,757.99			169,757.99
Delaware	66,431.40		66,431.40	
Florida	323,156.14	260,050.09		63,106.05
Georgia	7,926,220.87	7,904,830.27		21,390.60
Idaho	12,380.80		12,380.80	
Illinois	649,567.84		649,384.29	183.55
Indiana	956,733.22		955,383.02	1,350.20
Iowa	181,096.40		181,096.40	
Kansas	7,440,111.01	3,052.00	7,437,059.01	
Kentucky	153,425.80	41,865.00	111,560.80	
Louisiana	4,969,842.94	4,969,842.94		
Maryland	498,725.30		498,725.30	
Massachusetts	78,313.10			78,313.10
Michigan	365,750.80		365,750.80	
Minnesota	529,682.31		517,845.80	11,836.51
Mississippi	9,924,837.57	9,924,837.57		
Missouri	2,550,283.22	1,837,213.68	713,069.54	
Nebraska	1,011,917.17		1,011,917.17	
Nevada	15,988.80		15,988.80	
New Hampshire	1,754.20			1,754.20
New Jersey	6,147.60		6,147.60	
New Mexico	527,732.34	360,424.90	167,307.44	
New York	30,808.63		10,160.00	20,648.63
North Carolina	2,829,916.72	2,808,645.32	21,271.40	
Ohio	1,194,603.38		954,389.00	240,214.38
Oklahoma	12,745,521.26	11,595,657.46	1,149,863.80	
Oregon	60,961.80		60,961.80	
Pennsylvania	418,881.63		98,705.60	320,176.03
South Carolina	4,684,930.19	4,684,930.19		
South Dakota	699,725.60		699,725.60	
Tennessee	3,357,447.59	3,290,806.19	66,641.40	
Texas	44,580,877.37	42,970,646.63	1,610,230.74	
Utah	243,930.80		243,930.80	
Vermont	2,384.45			2,384.45
Virginia	460,013.12	128,672.93	331,340.19	
Washington	16,091.60		16,091.60	
West Virginia	43,165.40		43,165.40	
Wisconsin	359,773.44		16,441.00	343,332.44
Wyoming	4,025.60		4,025.60	
Totals	$131,076,487.50	$111,405,244.87	$18,396,794.50	$1,274,448.13

Table 4
Rental and Benefit Payments for the Calendar Year 1934
Analyzed by State and Commodity

State	Total	Cotton	Wheat	Tobacco	Corn-Hogs	Sugar
Ala.	$ 8,768,683.39	$ 8,544,792.56	$	$ 1,566.00	$ 222,324.83	
Ariz.	719,205.25	673,823.85	17,737.40		27,644.00	
Ark.	9,613,708.41	9,034,183.20	2,462.51	180.00	576,882.70	
Cal.	3,294,307.97	835,805.80	1,468,608.04		989,894.13	
Col.	4,070,360.91		2,818,670.70		1,251,690.21	
Conn.	674,876.45			652,592.10	22,284.35	
Del.	107,552.36		88,628.07		18,924.29	
Fla.	555,821.72	228,955.62		181,816.99	145,049.11	
Ga.	9,724,519.24	8,181,026.24	9,015.80	1,458,754.08	75,723.12	
Idaho	5,531,772.39		4,962,784.39		568,988.00	
Ill.	22,163,377.42		3,106,796.85	705.30	19,055,875.27	
Ind.	15,842,977.04		1,940,474.23	79,069.60	13,823,433.21	
Iowa	39,859,709.48		446,663.43		39,413,046.05	
Kan.	38,439,929.51	679.58	39,397,631.28	3,725.71	8,037,892.94	
Ky.	5,060,500.88	42,283.31	212,506.06	2,783,875.29	2,021,836.22	
La.	5,146,717.63	5,067,537.03			32,431.60	46,749
Me.	2,006.00				2,006.00	
Md.	1,068,441.39		772,599.75	38,510.37	257,331.27	
Mass.	469,513.87			282,006.00	187,507.87	
Mich.	2,363,501.30		839,548.15		1,523,953.15	
Minn.	12,569,798.62		2,251,676.39	38,324.63	10,279,797.60	
Miss.	9,844,828.90	9,813,914.30			30,914.60	
Mo.	16,257,948.24	1,213,968.59	1,588,466.38	55,740.42	13,399,772.85	
Mont.	9,265,512.77		8,981,267.05		284,245.72	
Neb.	23,497,149.08		8,248,580.99		15,248,568.09	
Nev.	53,972.01		26,884.37		27,087.64	
N.H.	23,623.30			5,982.00	17,641.30	
N.J.	176,396.09		11,329.36		165,066.73	
N.Mex.	1,300,293.67	512,354.31	581,917.64		206,021.72	
N.Y.	205,331.51		41,258.25	36,778.58	127,294.68	
N.Car.	10,312,062.26	4,281,957.84	48,924.39	5,658,055.02	323,125.01	
N.Dak.	24,415,874.23		22,960,318.33		1,455,555.90	
Ohio	11,480,789.92		1,509,863.81	511,488.92	9,459,437.19	
Okla.	18,554,789.79	6,594,471.66	9,566,709.21		2,393,608.92	
Ore.	4,185,553.49		3,819,386.85		366,166.64	
Pa.	1,199,959.54		263,927.08	686,785.36	249,247.10	
P.R.	1,188,639.00			1,188,639.00		
R.I.	2,176.84				2,176.84	
S.Car.	7,748,062.91	5,710,226.33		1,860,774.64	177,061.94	
S.Dak.	14,298,256.37		7,096,585.44		7,201,670.93	
Tenn.	5,281,624.70	2,844,034.92	94,685.72	701,730.42	1,641,173.64	
Tex.	35,760,774.71	27,340,849.42	6,215,436,97		2,204,488.32	
Utah	852,805.93		745,058.98		98,954.95	8,792
Vt.	38,582.35			6,778.18	31,804.17	
Va.	2,215,407.90	220,451.36	457,581.28	708,250.70	829,124.56	
Wash.	6,446,456.81		6,058,105.33		388,351.48	
W.Va.	256,353.02		65,777.92	36,262.76	154,312.34	
Wis.	4,692,740.51		40,118.52	742,824.28	3,909,797.71	
Wyo.	822,061.04		595,172.45		226,888.59	
Total	$396,425,308.12	$91,141,315.92	$128,353,159.37	$17,721,216.35	$159,154,075.48	$55,541

AMENDED MILK LICENSE FOR RICHMOND

Inequalities in payments to producers and charges to distributors are corrected in an amended milk license for Richmond, Virginia, completed by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The changes in the license come as a result of a hearing at Richmond in January and subsequent conferences with agencies on the market. Signed by Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace, the license will go into effect April 16, 1935.

Owing to the established custom in Richmond of selling milk to consumers in different market classes, it has been difficult to make equitable adjustments to meet practical requirements. The amended license is drafted to meet this complex situation in an acceptable way.

The amended license contains such fundamental provisions as (1) payment for milk by distributors on a butterfat basis rather than the former hundredweight basis, together with computations of returns to producers retained on the hundredweight basis; (2) payment to Guernsey and Jersey producers at the Class 1 price for the amount of milk sold to consumers as Guernsey and Jersey milk, apportioned among such producers of breed milk according to their established bases; (3) changing the Class 3 price from the New York 92 score wholesale butter basis, plus 10 percent thereof, to the straight New York 92 score butter market without additional allowance.

The license has also been redrafted to conform to the improved standard form, which clarifies and strengthens the provisions in relation to producer-distributors and other points relating to supervision and services on the market.

The license formerly provided that distributors pay producers a minimum price of $2.90 per 100 pounds of Class 1 milk of 4 percent butterfat, with payments in Classes 2 and 3 also on the hundredweight basis. There were differentials allowed also for variations in the butterfat test above or below 4 percent. Inasmuch as this method of payment by distributors and settlement with producers has not worked fairly and equitably owing to the wide range in butterfat test of the milk sold, and because a change to a butterfat payment basis to producers was not acceptable, the amended license provides as follows:

That distributors must pay 73 cents a pound of butterfat for Class 1 milk, 42-1/2 cents a pound of butterfat for Class 2 milk, and the New York 92 score butter quotation at wholesale as the basis for Class 3 milk payments. Adjustments to allow for differentials on butterfat content of milk purchased by distributors will be handled hereafter through the dealers' adjustment account in the pool before final payment of the blended price to producers is made. Producers will be paid as before on their deliveries of milk on the hundredweight basis, the effect of the new method being to correct inequalities arising from the charging of dealers for milk on the hundredweight basis.

Hitherto the milk of Guernsey and Jersey producers has been pooled with the rest of the milk on the market for purposes of payment and equalization, which penalized them because they were obliged to help carry the surplus of low-test milk. The amended license corrects this by giving the Guernsey and Jersey producers a special delivered base. The sum of all these special delivered

bases will equal the sales of such milk on the market. Producers of Guernsey and Jersey milk will be paid for all their milk which is sold as such special milk, at the Class 1 price, without sharing any of the surplus burden or having their price lowered through butterfat payments to them on a 4 percent standard. Milk which such producers deliver over and above their special delivered bases will be treated as the rest of the regular milk on the market, sharing in the surplus and taking the 4 percent classification.

The returns to the Guernsey and Jersey breeders for milk sold to consumers as Guernsey and Jersey milk will not be influenced by the sale of standard market milk by other producers. They are defined in the license as special producers. Their special delivered base milk is paid for by distributors at five times the Class 1 price per pound of butterfat defined in the license, with the remainder of their deliveries over the special delivered base taken into the regular pool. The effect of this is to remove both the volume and value of Guernsey and Jersey sales from the general pool, so it does not penalize such producers of breed milk of high fat test or work injury in any way to the balance of the producers in the market.

Changes in the provisions included in the newly drafted form of license, as amended, are summed up as follows: Producer-distributors are exempt from the pool account on all sales within their established bases, instead of being exempt only up to 500 pounds of milk representing the average daily retail route volume. The market administrator has the right to publicly disclose violations of the license, and with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, he may start proceedings to obtain collections of outstanding obligations. The authority is provided for the market administrator to make adjustments in prices paid producers for milk sold outside the defined sales area, to allow for prevailing prices in outside markets. Producers are accorded the right to provide their own systems of transportation of milk if they desire. Deductions for market services, according to the amended license, may be paid by dealers direct to the cooperative association for the rendering of market services. An advisory committee to aid in the supervision of marketing and financial problems, consisting of producers and distributors, may be appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

# # #

AMENDED MILK LICENSE FOR FALL RIVER, MASS.

Provisions for a milk advisory committee and certain restrictions on purchase of milk by distributors from new producers are the principal changes embodied in a redrafted and clarified form of milk license for the Fall River, Massachusetts, sales area, completed by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and signed by Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace. The effective date of the amended license is April 9, 1935.

The amended license provides that in addition to permission to establish a local milk industry board, the Secretary of Agriculture may appoint a milk advisory committee of producers and distributors to consider technical details related to marketing and finance associated with the administration of the license.

Distributors under the amended license are restricted in their purchases of milk from new producers by a requirement that they must pay the Class 2 or cream price for all milk delivered by such new producers for 90 days.

The volume of Class 1 sales in the area has remained fairly constant since the effective date of the license, April 1, 1934. The prices of Class 1 milk, at $3.40 per hundredweight, and Class 2 milk, based on the value of butterfat in cream of bottling quality on the Boston market, remain unchanged in the amended license.

The Fall River sales area, with a consuming population of about 137,000 persons, is located in both Massachusetts and Rhode Island, and a part of the milk supply is produced by Rhode Island farmers. Large quantities of cream also originate in other States than Massachusetts. The entire production zone is a deficit feed raising area and most producers depend heavily on purchased grain.

# # #

REGULATIONS ON THE USE OF RENTED TOBACCO ACRES

Modification for 1935 provisions in tobacco adjustment contracts governing the use of rented acres and the production of basic commodities has been announced by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

An administrative ruling, signed by the Secretary of Agriculture, provides that the provisions in tobacco contracts limiting the total acreage planted to crops shall be inoperative for 1935; that the provisions limiting the production of crops and livestock designated as basic commodities shall apply, for 1935, only to cotton, wheat, tobacco, and peanuts; and that provisions limiting the proportion of the "rented acres" which may be planted to food and feed crops for consumption on the farm shall be inoperative for 1935.

All of the rented acres under this ruling may be used for production of food and feed crops for consumption on the farm under contract. Last year, only one-half of the rented acres under tobacco contracts could be used for the production of food and feed crops for home consumption. The chief benefit to be derived from the modifications by tobacco farmers is the lifting of restrictions on the planting of corn. In most tobacco-growing areas, corn does not constitute a cash crop, and the production of a reasonable amount of corn in these areas is necessary to meet the feed requirements of a well-balanced system of farming.

# # #

NON-SIGNED CIGAR-TOBACCO GROWERS OFFERED CONTRACT

Producers of filler and binder types of cigar-leaf tobacco in the New England, Pennsylvania-New York, Wisconsin-Minnesota and Ohio-Indiana areas who have not previously participated in adjustment programs for these types, from April 17 to May 4, inclusive, will be given an opportunity to sign adjustment contracts, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has announced.

State and county agricultural agents will announce the time and place for non-contract signers to sign up in each county in the areas affected. The 22,629 contracts now in effect represent approximately 92 percent of the number of growers of filler and binder types of cigar-leaf tobacco in these regions.

New signers will be required to sign both the contract and a rider to the contract. The rider was optional in 1934 to producers who signed contracts in 1933 but was required as part of the contract of producers who signed in 1934. This rider offers producers choices additional to those offered in the original contract for determining base acreage. It also requires additional performance on the part of the producer. Rates of payment for 1935 to producers subject to the rider will be higher than to producers not subject to the rider.

In order to give all qualified producers an opportunity to take advantage of the terms of the rider, producers who signed contracts in 1933 but did not execute the rider in 1934 may sign the rider during the same period (April 17-May 4) that previous non-signers may sign contracts.

# # #

TENTATIVE APPROVAL OF RED SOUR CHERRY AGREEMENT

Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace has given tentative approval to a marketing agreement for red sour cherries for canning and cold packing, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has announced. The agreement would provide minimum prices to growers. It now goes to members of the industry for signature.

Commercial production for canning and cold packing is for the most part confined to the States of Michigan, New York, Wisconsin, Oregon, Washington, Utah, Nebraska, Colorado, Montana, Idaho, Pennsylvania and Ohio. The industry's average annual production is about 70,000,000 pounds. Since 1930 prices to producers have declined to ruinously low levels and during the 1934 season growers in many commercial areas received less than one cent per pound above their harvesting costs.

Under the agreement a control committee composed of sixteen members would be set up, with provisions also for representation by districts. The first district would consist of all States east of the State of Ohio and the Ohio and Mississippi rivers; the second district would include Michigan, Ohio and Indiana; the third district, Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri; the fourth Oregon and Washington; and the fifth, all other States.

In the making of control committee decisions the first district would have one vote, the second one vote, and the third, fourth and fifth districts together one vote. Two of the three regional votes and nine of the sixteen individual votes would be required in all decisions of the control committee.

The agreement provides that prior to June 10 of each year the control committee recommend a minimum price to be paid to producers for the current year's crop of cherries. The recommendation would become effective upon the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and on a date specified by him. Growers would then be assured of receiving at least the minimum price for all red sour cherries sold for canning or cold packing.

The agreement names original members of the control committee and their alternates so that a program could be undertaken without delay if and when the agreement is given final approval. Their successors would be elected in each district by the processor or producer groups represented. The proposed personnel follows:

First District: F. H. Van Eenwyk of East Williamson, N. Y., and L. E. Aunger of Holley, N. Y., representing processors. Alternates, William Bentley of Middleport, N. Y., and C. C. Scutt of Red Creek, N. Y.

E. G. Butts of Sodus, N. Y., and Alfred G. Lewis, Jr., of Geneva, N. Y., representing producers. Alternates, Carl G. Wooster of Union Hill, N. Y., and Judson Swift of Middleport, N. Y.

Elmer B. Milliman of Rochester, N. Y., alternate James A. Cameron of Rochester, whose successors would be elected by a majority vote of the other members of the First District group.

Second District: Howard C. Morgan of Traverse City, Mich., and W. A. Godfrey of Benton Harbor, Mich., representing processors. Alternates W. P. Hartman of Grand Rapids, Mich., and H. K. Royal of Shelby, Mich.

A. J. Rogers of Traverse City, alternate C. W. Hinman of Benton Harbor, representing producers' cooperatives.

Geo. W. Bolling of Traverse City and H. S. Newton of Hart, Mich., representing producers. Alternates Homer C. Willobee of Traverse City and Forrest Steimle of Eau Claire, Mich.

Third District: Karl S. Reynolds of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., alternate Earl S. Johnson of Sturgeon Bay, representing processors.

A. W. Lawrence of Sturgeon Bay, alternate Thomas A. Sanderson of Sturgeon Bay, representing producers.

Fourth District: B. E. Maling of Hillsboro, Ore., alternate O. E. Shay of Puyallup, Wash., representing dealers.

L. M. Hatch of Puyallup, alternate L. G. Mecklem of Everson, Wash., representing producers.

Fifth District: C. L. Wright of Pleasant Grove, Utah, alternate Hugh Scilley of Loveland, Colo., representing processors.

J. M. Ramsey of Loveland, alternate J. W. Francis of Brigham City, Utah, representing producers.

# # #

HEARING ON PRUNE LICENSE CITATIONS

Hearings on the cases of three handlers charged with violation of the license for dried prunes produced in California have been scheduled for April 17,

the San Francisco Post Office Building, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has announced. Notice of the hearing date was sent to the three shippers involved -- P. F. McKinney, the George Martino Packing Co., and the East Side Fruit Co., all of San Jose.

In orders issued last month, directing the shippers to show cause why their licenses should not be revoked or suspended, 15 charges were listed against McKinney, and 16 each against the East Side Co. and the George Martino Co. Allegations included failure to hold for the order of the industry's control board the reserve tonnage of standard and substandard prunes, failure to determine and report the quantity of each class of prunes acquired, unauthorized sale and shipment of substandard prunes, failure to keep adequate books and records, failure to supply the control board with information on purchases and sales, and failure to pay control board assessments.

Findings at the scheduled hearings will be the basis of a decision by the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether suspension or revocation of the licenses of any or all of the shippers is warranted.

# # #

HEARING ON PROPOSED BARTLETT PEAR MARKET AGREEMENT

A proposed marketing agreement for Pacific Coast Bartlett Pears for canning will be considered at three public hearings, the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has announced. The plan provides for a limit on the quantities on No. 2 and cull pears which could be canned during the 1935 season. No restrictions would be placed on the canning of No. 1 pears.

One of the hearings will be held at Berkeley, Cal., April 19; another at Medford, Ore., April 22; and the third at Yakima, Wash., April 25.

The proposed agreement applies to the States of California, Oregon and Washington. Growers and canners advocating the agreement believe that controlling the pack by limiting the quantity of No. 2 and cull pears canned is necessary to insure fair prices to growers, in view of the probable carryover of canned pears and the possibility of a large 1935 crop.

The agreement would be administered by a control committee of sixteen members; composed of four representatives of California growers, four representatives of California canners, four members representing Northwest growers, and four representing Northwest canners.

Under the proposed agreement, no canner may can any lot of pears in which No. 2 and cull pears exceeded ten percent of the total. It is provided, however, that in case of a short crop the committee could, by a two-thirds vote of its grower members and a two-thirds vote of its canner members, issue special rules which would permit the canning of enough No. 2 pears to insure a total pack large enough to meet the estimated demand during the succeeding season.

# # #

QUALITY STANDARDS SOUGHT UNDER CANTALOUPE AGREEMENT

The improvement of returns to North Carolina cantaloupe growers, through raising the quality of cantaloupes shipped, and through bettering marketing conditions, is the aim of a proposed marketing agreement and license for shippers of cantaloupes grown in North Carolina. The proposed plan was submitted by a committee of growers. The agreement and license will be considered at a public hearing at Warrenton on April 23, and at Laurinburg on April 25.

The proposed agreement provides for a control committee of seven members, three of whom would be named at a general election of shippers, and four elected by growers of their respective districts. District 1 would consist of Scotland county; District 2 would consist of Hoke, Robeson and Cumberland counties; District 3 would consist of Duplin and Wayne counties, of all cantaloupe-producing counties not otherwise named through which the Neuse River flows, and all such counties lying south and west of the Neuse River, and District 4 would consist of Warren county and all other cantaloupe-producing counties not mentioned above.

In the past, shipments of immature cantaloupes usually have resulted in market conditions detrimental to the industry as a whole. Under the proposed agreement no cantaloupes failing to measure up to the control committee's standards of maturity could be shipped. The control committee also would be empowered to confine shipments, during specified periods, to cantaloupes of certain United States grades. It also would determine the eligible percentage of the entire crop available for shipment during the period, and on justified written application would be authorized to grant exemptions enabling producers whose eligible percentage was smaller than the percentage for the industry as a whole to ship enough of the remainder of their crop to bring their shipments up to the eligible percentage.

The proposed agreement would provide that all cantaloupes shipped be certified by the Federal-State Inspection Service as conforming to United States Grades and Standards. All closed containers would bear the name of the producer or marketer, the name of the variety, and the United States Grade of the contents.

# # #

TWO-MONTH STATISTICS ON SUGAR

The Sugar Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has issued its statement of sugar statistics for January and February 1935, obtained directly from cane refiners, beet sugar processors, and importers.

The summary statement is based upon statistics obtained in the administration of the Jones-Costigan Act, which requires the Secretary of Agriculture to determine consumption requirements and establish quotas for various sugar producing areas.

SUGAR STATISTICAL REPORTS

Vol. 2, Report 2, Period: Jan.-Feb., 1935

Table 1

Raw Sugar: Refiners' stocks, receipts, meltings, and deliveries for direct consumption for January and February 1935 1/

(in short tons raw sugar value)

Source of supply	Stocks on Jan. 1, 1935	Receipts	Meltings	Deliveries for direct consumption	Lost by fire etc.	Stocks on Feb. 28, 1935
Cuba	283,703	154,788	332,794	311	48	105,338
Hawaii	65,009	114,328	121,754	305	0	57,278
Puerto Rico	6,194	139,812	108,830	16	0	37,160
Philippines	158,754	96,843	139,158	506	0	115,933
Continental	19,913	46,534	50,910	75	0	15,462
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other countries	554	12,680	8,002	8	0	5,224
Miscellaneous (sweepings, etc.)	0	117	117	0	0	0
Total	534,127	565,102	761,565	1,221	48	336,395

1/ Compiled in the A.A.A. Sugar Section from reports submitted on form SS-15A by 16 companies representing 22 refiners. The companies are:

American Sugar Refining Co.
Arbuckle Bros.
J. Aron & Co., Inc.
California & Hawaiian Sugar Refining Corp., Ltd.
Colonial Sugars Co.
Godchaux Sugars, Inc.
William Henderson
Western Sugar Refinery
Imperial Sugar Co.
W.J. McCahan Sugar Refining & Molasses Co.
National Sugar Refining Co. of New Jersey
Ohio Sugar Co.
Pennsylvania Sugar Co.
Revere Sugar Refinery
Savannah Sugar Refining Corporation
Sterling Sugars, Inc.

This report includes all the refineries in the United States with the exception of 3 Louisiana refineries melting only Louisiana raw sugars, the aggregate output of which is relatively small.

Table 2
Stocks, production, and distribution of cane and beet sugar by United States refiners and processors, January - February 1935
(in terms of short tons refined value)

	Refiners	Domestic beet factories 5/	Refiners and beet factories
Initial stocks of refined	302,898 2/	1,060,184 2/	1,363,082 2/
Production	705,781	20,837	726,618
Deliveries	647,201 1/	205,401 3/	852,602 4/
Final stocks of refined	361,478	875,620	1,237,098

Compiled by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Sugar Section, from reports submitted by refiners. Cane sugar refined by three Louisiana refineries, the aggregate output which is relatively small, is not yet included in this summary

1/ Deliveries include sugar delivered against sales for export. Department of Commerce reports of exports of refined sugar amounted to 21,566 tons during January-February 1935

2/ Revised.

3/ Larger than actual deliveries by a small amount representing losses in transit, through reprocessing, etc.

4/ Equivalent to 912,284 short tons 96 degree raw sugar.

5/ Beet sugar statistics apply to the period January 1 - March 3, 1935, inclusive.

Table 3
Stocks, receipts, and deliveries of direct consumption sugar from specified areas, January - February 1935.
(in terms of short tons of refined sugar)

Source of supply	Stocks on Jan. 1, 1935	Receipts	Deliveries or usage	Stocks on Feb. 28, 1935
Cuba	162,139 1/	36,765	48,637	150,267 1/
Hawaii	0	1,085	1,085	0
Puerto Rico	6,478	19,365	14,021	11,822
Philippines	8,134	4,438	6,197	6,375
England	10	0	2	8
China and Hong Kong	0	35	35	0
Other foreign areas	0	813	37	776
Total	176,761	62,501	70,014	169,248

Compiled in the A. A. A. Sugar Section from reports and information submitted on forms SS-15B and SS-3 by importers and distributors of direct consumption sugar. The distribution of Louisiana direct consumption sugar is not included.

1/ Includes sugar in bond and in customs custody and control. Statistics for one importer incomplete.

# # #

FUND FOR STUDY OF INSECT PESTS IN PUERTO RICO

The allotment of $93,000 from Puerto Rico sugar processing tax funds for research on insect pests affecting agriculture in Puerto Rico has been announced by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The allotment was made, under the "general benefit of agriculture" provisions of the Jones-Costigan amendment, through Puerto Rico Tax Fund Order No. 2, which has been signed by R. G. Tugwell as Acting Secretary of Agriculture, and approved by the President.

The allotment is for the study and investigation of a number of insect pests in Puerto Rico, including sugarcane insects, the corn ear worm, vegetable insects, cotton insects, the horn fly, mosquitoes, the coconut beetle, and coffee insects. Some of these insects are common both to Puerto Rico and parts of the United States. The order directs the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine of the Department of Agriculture to conduct the research.

# # #

FUNDS FOR PUERTO RICAN SOIL EROSION SURVEY

A soil erosion survey in Puerto Rico will be undertaken with an allotment of $42,000 for that purpose from the sugar processing tax funds from that area, the Sugar Section of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration has announced. The allotment was made under the "general benefit of agriculture" provisions of the Jones-Costigan Act in Puerto Rico Tax Fund Order No. 3, which was signed by Acting Secretary of Agriculture R. G. Tugwell and approved by the President.

The survey is to be made for "the purpose of developing and establishing measures for erosion control," the order states. The survey which is to be in charge of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils of the United States Department of Agriculture has been recommended by the Puerto Rico Policy Committee.

# # #

FIVE CODES TRANSFERRED TO NATIONAL RECOVERY BOARD

The administration of five codes of fair competition has been transferred by executive order of President Roosevelt from the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to the National Industrial Recovery Board, the Adjustment Administration has announced, Terms of the transfer reserve for the Secretary of Agriculture powers in matters pertaining to growers. Codes affected are those for the Wheat Flour Milling Industry, the Feed Manufacturing Industry, the Country Grain Elevator Industry of the United States, the Malt Industry, and the Southern Rice Milling Industry. President Roosevelt signed the order March 30.

It is provided that written approval of the Secretary of Agriculture shall be required on all actions involving fixing or control of prices to agricultural producers and to first processors, or of brokerage fees on such transactions; credits and financial charges with reference to agricultural products; commission rates on purchases from producers or from first processors; purchasing arrangements with regard to agricultural commodities in their original form; marketing quotas involving producers or first processors; and plant capacity and allocation, it also is provided that the Secretary of Agriculture

retain the right to appoint a non-voting member to each of the five code authorities.

Adjustment Administration officials point out that for the most part the fair trade practices provided in the five codes concern dommercial practices within the industries. They feel that unified administration by the NIRB will improve the effectiveness of the codes, and that producers will be benefited indirectly by the change.

# # #